

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re The Application Of:

Laurence Honarvar

Serial No. 09/216,985

Group Art Unit: 3627

Confirmation No. 8897

Filed: December 21, 1998

Examiner: Sheikh, Asfand M

For: SIMULTANEOUS CUSTOMER/ACCOUNT STRATEGY EXECUTION IN A DECISION
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner's Answer appears to generally reassert arguments already of record, and which were addressed in the Appeal Brief. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the arguments in the Appeal Brief are sufficient to respond to the outstanding rejections.

* * *

However, it should be noted that, on page 14 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner wrote:

Appellant has not argued any aspects (i.e. motivation to combine) of the 103 rejection not being proper. The examiner is assuming that Appellant concurs with the examiner in that the combination is proper.

In response, the Appellant would like to clarify that the deficiencies of the cited references are set forth in the Appeal Brief. Due to these deficiencies, the Appellant respectfully submits that, as set forth in the Appeal Brief, the combination of references does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 15, 2019 By: Paul I. Kravetz

Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230